9 Hallowell E-4 (no date) 1943 SG4 Araucanians SG4

VOL. 45 JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1943 No. 3, PART 1

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

New Series

Organ of the American Anthropological Association, the American Ethnological Society, the Anthropological Society of Washington, and the Philadelphia Anthropological Society

000

CONTENTS

Energy and the Evolution of Culture. LESLIE A. WHITE 335

The General Problem of Hopi Adjustment. DOROTHY EGGAN 357

A Reconsideration of the Natchez Social Structure. C. W. M. HART 374

Notes on Papago Color Designations. LILA M. O'NEALE and JUAN DOLORES 387

The Social Use of Kinship Terms Among Brazilian Indians. CLAUDE LEVI STRAUSS 398

Linguistic Aspects of Yaqui Acculturation. EDWARD H. SPICER 410

A Clear Case of Linguistic Acculturation. JEAN BASSETT JOHNSON 427

The Linguistic Aspect of Wintu Acculturation. D. D. LEE 435

Bronislaw Malinowski. GEORGE PETER MURDOCK 441

Edgar Billings Howard. FRANK H. H. ROBERTS, JR. 452

BOOK REVIEWS ..... *See rear cover*

SOME NEW PUBLICATIONS 481

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS ..... *See rear cover*

NOTES AND NEWS 494

Published by the

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

[title page]

9:Hallowell E-4 (no date)1943 SG4 Araucanians SG4

ARAUCANIAN PARALLELS TO THE OMAHA KINSHIP PATTERN

121 (*Introductory note:* At the Poughkeepsie meetings of the American Anthropological Association in 1929 I presented the following paper. I never published it, mainly because I obtained the information from a single informant and hoped that I might later substantiate and elaborate my original notes. Such an opportunity never arose. But during the subsequent years no one else, so far as I can discover has reported the occurrence of the Omaha kinship structure among the Araucanians.[1] However, now, when attention is being increasingly focused upon all things South American, it seems worth while to place my information on record. The immediate stimulus to publication came from Dr. Murdock who, in a discussion following a lecture he gave before the Philadelphia Anthropological Society in December, 1942, remarked that in his survey of social organisations and kinship patterns throughout the world, he was struck by the absence of the Omaha pattern in South America, although he suspected its presence among the Araucanians. Its absence in South America seemed significant because of its presence in the other four major areas of the world from which he selected his sample. I hope that the publication of the following paper, even at this late date, may ultimately lead to a final settlement of the question.)

114 In the current number of the AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, Dr. Lesser has brought a very important problem to a focus.[2] He demonstrates the fairly consistent association

[1] See Donald D. Brand, *A Brief History of Araucanian Studies* (New Mexican Anthropologist, V, 1941), pp. 2, 19–52.

[2] A. Lesser, *Kinship Origins in the Light of some Distributions* (AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST), 31, 1929), pp. 710–730.

[p.489]

9:Hallowell E-4 (no date)1943 SG4 Araucanians SG4

114 of kinship systems of the Omaha and Crow types, with specific social traits. With some exceptions, marriage with the wife's brother's daughter, patrilocal residence after marriage, patrilineal descent and exogamic organization, are coincidental with the Omaha pattern. From the geographical standpoint, these associated features occur in two centers in North America: in certain parts of California, on the one hand, and among certain tribes of the plains and Eastern Woodlands, on the other. An extra-American center is East Africa. Since, at present, there seems to be no reason for assuming historical contacts between these three centers, Dr. Lesser concludes that we have a case of "repeated independent origins," diffusion within limited areas and a probable functional correlation between the kinship type and social traits.

I wish to lend support to Dr. Lesser's conclusions by calling attention to a fourth region, where a similar association of the Omaha pattern with the social features referred to, appears to occur.

115 Some years ago (1922) I obtained a set of kinship terms from Mr. J. Martin Collio Huaquillof, an Araucanian Indian who was then staying in Philadelphia. At the time I was not familiar with the Omaha pattern but was greatly impressed with the close correlation of the use of terms and the marriage customs which he described. Later I read Gifford's account of the Miwok[3] and became cognizant of the occurrence of the same correlated features elsewhere. Since my data were based on information obtained from a single informant, however, I hesitated to publish it, particularly as a superficial review of the literature dealing with the Araucanians failed to yield information which elucidated or confirmed the sociological side of the problem. But as I now see it, it seems extremely unlikely that my informant could have fabricated the Omaha system as well as its associated customs. He was particularly clear in respect to the customs of marriage with the wife's brother's daughter, although I have not been able to find any published reference to this type of preferential mating. He was also positive in respect to the customs of patrilocal residence, patrilineal inheritance and succession, and a very close association between the father's sister and her cross nieces and nephews. But I could elicit nothing from him which suggested the presence of exogamous father sibs.

[582] [591] [604]

114 Since obtaining the data from Collio, I have been checking the kinship vocabulary I secured from him with all the published vocabularies from Valdivia (1606) down to the present, in order to see whether it is possible to establish the occurrence of the Omaha pattern in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The results so far have been somewhat discouraging since the elucidation of the use of terms in the older records is not altogether satisfactory and there is some negative evidence. On the other hand, there may have been changes in the kinship system and in social organization during the historic period. This possibility must be considered especially since Latcham,[4] the foremost student of Araucanian history and ethnology, has attempted to demonstrate the occurrence of a totemic sib organization with matrilineal descent and matrilocal residence for the old Araucanians. A systematic investigation of the contemporary social organi-

---

[3] E. W. Gifford, *California Kinship Terminologies* (University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology, No. 18), pp. 1–285, with 29 maps, 1922.

[4] R. E. Latcham, *Ethnology of the Araucanians* (*Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, XXXIX, 1909), pp. 334–370, and *La organización social y las creencias religiosas de los antiguos araucanos* (1924).

9:Hallowell E-4 (no date)1943 SG4 Araucanians SG4

114 [611] [587]

sation of the Araucanians might help to solve this problem and Dr. S. K. Lothrop, who is now in Chile, may obtain data on some of the disputed points. That certain patrilineal traits, at least, have been present in the historic period there is little doubt. Even Latcham admits this. One of these is patrilineal inheritance which bears directly on the problem under discussion. In relation to marriage it operates through the levirate and by the inheritance, by sons, of their father's wives. Collio, moreover, informed me that cross-cousin marriage was practiced. Now Gifford showed that, in the case of the Miwok, the transfer by a man to his sons of the privilege of marriage with the wife's brother's daughter probably led to cross-cousin marriage. I suspect that this was likewise happened among the Araucanians and as in the Miwok case it has apparently not affected their kinship terms to any very noticeable degree.

The Araucanians thus offer a fruitful field, not only for the study of the functional correlation of kinship terms and social customs, but one in which there is some possibility that the historical development of these features may be traced.

601

The significant features of the kinship picture are the following:

In ego's generation parallel cousins are classified with siblings. The terms for cross-cousins are highly diagnostic. The children of mother's brother (to both a male and a female) are *wéko* = mother's brother) and *ñáñe* (= referential term for mother, mother's sister, in the latter case usually with the qualifying suffix *-domo*, "woman" or *-ats*, "almost, close to,"). This "uncleship" descends in the male line to the generation below ego and beyond, and the sisters of *wéko* are always *ñáñe*. The children of a *ñáñe*, on the other hand, are siblings to ego regardless of biological generation.

On the paternal side in ego's generation the children of father's sister (*pálu*, a reciprocal term) are classified with a man's sisters' children (*ichíam;* no sexual differentiation). To a woman, on the other hand, father's sister's children are classified with own or sister's children (*hotái*). The children of father's sister's children are grandchildren.

Wife's brother's daughter marriage and sororate marriage are reflected by the fact that a reciprocal term *kurún* is used between a man and his wife's brother's daughter, which is also the term used by a man for wife's sister and by a woman for sister's husband. My informant stated that to use this term meant "I am liable to be on your neck" or "enter your arms" at any time. In short, it applies to a potential mateship which correlates with customary practices. The brother of a woman called *kurún* by a man is *kémpu*, so this term applies to wife's brother, wife's brother's son, wife's brother's son's son. It is also the term for man's sister's husband and his *father's sister's husband*, which points to the same functional equivalence of sister and father's sister as does the use of *kurún* for a woman and her brother's daughter. According to Lesser, the functional, if not terminological, identification of a woman, her father's sister and her brother's daughter, is the key to the Omaha type of kinship structure.

A. Irving Hallowell

University of Pennsylvania